

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

---

AUSTIN P. BOND, as Special Administrator  
of the Estate of BILLY WOODS, deceased,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
OF MUSKOGEE COUNTY, OKLAHOMA,

*Defendant,*

---

Case No. CIV-18-108-RAW

**ORDER**

Before the court are the objections posed during the deposition of witness Angela Miller.

The court has made the following rulings to specific deposition questions, as follows:

**Transcript of Video Deposition of**

**Angela Miller taken February 28, 2019.**

- 1) Page 11, lines 12-18 – Defendant objection – relevance, confusing and waste of time  
– **OVERRULED.**
- 2) Page 12, lines 15-25 – Defendant objection – relevance, confusing and waste of time  
– **OVERRULED.**
- 3) Page 52, lines 2- 8, 16-23 – Defendant objection – relevance, confusing the issue and  
waste of time – **OVERRULED.**
- 4) Page 53, lines 18-25 and Page 54, lines 1-2 – Defendant objection – relevance,  
confusing the issue and waste of time, prejudicial – **OVERRULED.**

- 5) Page 61, lines 17-21 – Plaintiff objection – hearsay, no personal knowledge – **OVERRULED.**
- 6) Page 75, lines 2-13 – Plaintiff objection – improper designation, incomplete answer, confusing – **OVERRULED.**
- 7) Page 86, lines 17-25, Page 87, line 1 and lines 9-25 and Page 88, lines 2-9 – Defendant objection – hearsay – **OVERRULED..**
- 8) Page 88, lines 10-25 – Defendant objection – hearsay, prejudicial, confusing the issues - **SUSTAINED.**
- 9) Page 89, lines 1-8 – Defendant objection – hearsay, prejudicial, confusing the issues – **SUSTAINED.**
- 10) Page 89, lines 9-20 – Defendant objection – speculative, no personal knowledge – **SUSTAINED.**
- 11) Page 89, lines 23-25 and Page 90, lines 1-2 – Defendant objection - hearsay – **SUSTAINED.**
- 12) Page 93, lines 1-8 – Defendant objection – hearsay – **SUSTAINED.**
- 13) Page 119, lines 7-12 – Defendant objection – leading, misstates testimony - **OVERRULED.**
- 14) Page 124, lines 13-25 – Defendant objection – leading, speculation, no personal knowledge – **OVERRULED.**
- 15) Page 128, lines 15-19 – Defendant objection – leading – **OVERRULED.**
- 16) Page 162, lines 7-9, 14-16 – Plaintiff objection – character evidence, improper lay opinion – **OVERRULED.**

- 17) Page 174, lines 1-6 – Plaintiff objection re: Defendant objection – form – **OVERRULED.**
- 18) Page 174, lines 16-19 – Plaintiff objection – improper designation, no question designated, incomplete answer, confusing – **SUSTAINED.**
- 19) Page 178, line 9 – Plaintiff objection – form – **OVERRULED.**
- 20) Page 179, lines 16-19 – Plaintiff objection – assumes facts not in evidence – **OVERRULED.**
- 21) Page 192, lines 7 – Plaintiff objection – form – **OVERRULED.**
- 22) Page 193, lines 11-12 – Plaintiff objection – question lacks context, leading to confusion – **OVERRULED.**
- 23) Page 214, lines 19-22 – Plaintiff objection – leading – **SUSTAINED.**
- 24) Page 216, lines 18-19, 21-22 – Plaintiff objection – calls for speculation – **OVERRULED.**
- 25) Page 227, lines 5-17 – Plaintiff objection – no personal knowledge, improper lay opinion – **OVERRULED.**
- 26) Page 242, lines 20-22 – Plaintiff objection – improper lay opinion, no personal knowledge, prejudicial – **OVERRULED.**
- 27) Page 244, lines 9-12 – Plaintiff objection – speculative, hypothetical question – **OVERRULED.**
- 28) Page 251, lines 8-13 – Defendant objection – hearsay, leading – **OVERRULED.**
- 29) Page 253, lines 8-12, 15-24 and Page 254, lines 2-5 – Defendant objection – leading, assumes facts not in evidence, hearsay – **OVERRULED.**

30) Page 256, lines 2-9, Defendant objection – relevance, confuses the issues, wastes time, prejudicial – **OVERRULED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 2nd day of July, 2020.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ronald A. White".

---

**HONORABLE RONALD A. WHITE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**